

trying to hobble to the base, recaptured, and returned to the camp he had escaped, where he was tortured some more.

A few days later Bud's captors took him to the prison we called the Plantation, where I would meet him 2 months later. He was one of the most grievously injured pilots to arrive in Hanoi. Norris helped nurse him back to some semblance of health, although he would never fully recover from his wounds. Then Bud helped Norris nurse me.

Whenever I felt my spirits and resistance flag, I looked to Bud for the courage to continue and for the example of how to serve my country in difficult circumstances. Bud was the bravest man I ever knew, and I have known more than a few. He was great company too and made it possible to actually have fun in prison once in a while. He received the Medal of Honor when he came home—the highest of his many decorations for valor. Despite his injuries, he managed to regain flying status and commanded a flight wing at Eglin Air Force Base.

When Bud ultimately retired from the Air Force, he practiced law. After his service in World War II but before he deployed to the Korean war, he graduated from college and law school. He devoted his practice to defending the interests of his fellow veterans.

Bud and I stayed close through all the years that have passed since our war. We talked often. We saw each other regularly. He campaigned with me in all my campaigns and advised me always. We argued sometimes, agreed more often, laughed a lot, and always enjoyed each other's company. I am going to miss him terribly.

Even though Bud had reached advanced years, for some reason I could never imagine Bud yielding to anything—even, I thought, to the laws of nature. Tough old bird that he was, I always thought he would outlive us all. But he is gone now to a heaven I expect he imagined would look like an Iowa cornfield in early winter, filled with pheasants.

I will miss Bud every day for the rest of my life, but I will see him again. I know I will. I will hunt the field with him, and I look forward to it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to eulogize a great American about whom Senator McCain has just spoken. It has been said it is the soldier who has given us our most important freedoms over the course of our history. That is certainly a true statement in the case of Air Force Col. George "Bud" Day.

Colonel Day was a good friend of Senator McCain's. He was a resident of

Florida, living in the Fort Walton Beach area. Sadly, he passed away, but at the very extended life's age of 88.

I want to—in addition to Senator McCain's comments—take a moment to honor and remember this American hero, who was one of the most highly decorated service members this country has ever seen. He was a Medal of Honor recipient. He was a veteran of three wars—World War II, the Korean war, and the war in Vietnam.

Because his F-100 fighter jet was shot down, he ended up being a prisoner of war in Vietnam for nearly 6 years, and there in Hanoi he and Senator McCain became cellmates.

When asked about their experience together, Senator McCain said:

I owe my life to Bud, and much of what I know about character and patriotism. He was the bravest man I ever knew.

Senator McCain has just recounted a number of those things. I do not know, but I have heard it said, either from Colonel Day or Senator McCain, that it was JOHN MCCAIN who was put into that cell nearly dead—after his arm was broken when he ejected from his aircraft, and after he had been beaten—and Bud Day nursed him back to health.

After the POWs were released from Vietnam, interestingly, Colonel Day returned to active duty, and he returned to active flying status. He retired in 1977 as the Air Force's most decorated officer.

It has also been said that a nation can be judged by how it treats those who have borne its battles. After he left the Air Force, Colonel Day—listen to this—continued public service. He went to law school. He practiced law and he championed veterans' issues.

So I wanted to take a moment, after an emotional speech by Senator McCain, to say that I say, and many are saying, a little prayer of thanks that Colonel Bud Day helped preserve the freedoms of this country with his service to this country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LANCE CORPORAL BENJAMIN W. TUTTLE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respect to an American hero, LCpl Benjamin Tuttle, who sacrificed his life for this country in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Lance Corporal Tuttle graduated from Gentry High School in Gentry, AR, in 2012. His appreciation for athletics kept him active after school as a football player, wrestler, and track runner. As a student, he made his in-

terest in serving in the Marines well known. He shared his love for his country and the corps during a trip back to his alma mater last fall.

His love of country was coupled with love for his family. In a Facebook post, he wrote he would be back home in October and was anxious to fish, go to dinner, and just hang out with family and friends.

Lance Corporal Tuttle was serving aboard the USS *Nimitz*. He was assigned to the Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 323, Marine Aircraft Group 11, 3rd Aircraft Wing, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar in California.

Lance Corporal Tuttle was only 19 when he gave his life for his country. Lance Corporal Tuttle is a true American hero who made the ultimate sacrifice. I ask my colleagues to keep his family and friends in their thoughts and prayers.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I humbly offer my sincerest gratitude for his patriotism and selfless service.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SILICON VALLEY IMMIGRATION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, the need for economic growth remains one of the most pressing and challenging issues we face today in our country. Unfortunately, over the past decade economic growth has been stagnant, creating difficulties for small businesses, for working families, for recent college graduates, and for entrepreneurs.

If I have a goal here, it is to make certain every American has the opportunity to pursue what we all know is the American dream. For that to be possible, we need a growing economy that accomplishes many things, including creating the opportunity for people to go to work, to pay off their loans, to feed their families, to put food on their families' table, and to save for their future.

Last month the Senate had an opportunity to do something positive about our economy. We spent a significant amount of time addressing this issue of immigration, trying to fix our Nation's broken immigration system.

Sensible and overdue improvements to our Nation's immigration laws will spur economic growth and create American jobs. This is why I have been so interested to see how highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants create jobs and contribute to the U.S. economy. It is that aspect of our Nation's broken immigration system I wish to talk about today.

There is an economic imperative to improve our Nation's immigration laws. Many of our Nation's leading businesses struggle to find the talent they need to grow and compete in global markets. According to the Partnership for a New American Economy, American businesses are projected to need an estimated 800,000 workers with advanced STEM degrees by 2018 but will only find 550,000 American graduates with an advanced STEM education.

First and foremost, we must do more to prepare Americans for careers in science, technology, and engineering. I have been encouraged that several immigration proposals before Congress aim to improve STEM education for Americans so that one day we will no longer be required to seek outside labor to meet our country's needs.

In the short term, we must work to equip Americans with the skills of the 21st century. We also need to create a path for highly skilled foreign students to stay in the United States, where their ideas, talents, and intellect can fuel American economic growth.

Legislation I introduced with Senator WARNER of Virginia called Startup Act 3.0 creates visas for foreign students who graduate from an American university with a master's or Ph.D. in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics. These skilled workers would be granted conditional status contingent on them filling a needed gap in the U.S. workforce. This will help growing American companies secure the talent they need now for current job openings. Without this help companies will have to look elsewhere, will find it difficult to find the qualified workers they need, and will likely open locations overseas, taking the jobs with them.

When I was in Silicon Valley last year, I met with executives at Facebook. They told me they were ready to hire close to 80 foreign-born but U.S.-educated individuals in California, but their H-1B visas were not granted. Rather than forgo these skilled workers, the company hired them anyway. That caught my attention, but the story is that they placed them in Dublin, Ireland, not in the United States. Facebook was ultimately able to get visas for these workers after training them in Ireland, but all too often companies end up housing the jobs permanently overseas. When this happens, it is not only those specific jobs that are lost. In this case we didn't just lose 80 jobs but also the many supporting jobs and economic activity associated with those jobs.

Even more damaging, more damning, more frustrating to me is that many of these highly skilled workers who are now employed in some other country will become entrepreneurs that will start successful businesses there, not in the United States. Of the 80 engineers working in Dublin, Ireland, for Facebook, I have no doubt but that one or more of them will be the next origi-

nator, the next innovator for companies such as Facebook. We want them in the United States creating that opportunity here for Americans.

Immigrants to the United States have a long history of creating businesses in our country. Today, 1 in every 10 Americans employed at a privately owned U.S. company works at an immigrant-owned firm. Immigrants are more than twice as likely as native-born Americans to start a business. Of the current Fortune 500 companies, more than 40 percent were founded by a first- or second-generation American. Ranked No. 73 on that list is Google, which was cofounded in 1998 by Sergey Brin, an immigrant from Russia. Sergey and his cofounder Larry Page developed Google as Ph.D. students while at Stanford University. Google is now the world's top search engine, generates more than \$50 billion in revenue annually, and employs tens of thousands. We need to create an immigration system that welcomes more immigrants like Sergey Brin.

Our bill, Startup Act 3.0, creates an entrepreneur's visa for foreign-born entrepreneurs currently in the United States. Those individuals with a good idea, capital, and a willingness to hire Americans would be able to stay in the United States and grow their businesses here. Each immigrant entrepreneur would be required to create jobs for Americans. Providing a way for an immigrant entrepreneur to stay in the United States and create American jobs makes economic sense.

Earlier this year the Kauffman Foundation, headquartered in Kansas City, studied the economic impact of the entrepreneur's visa in Startup Act 3.0. Using conservative estimates, the Kauffman Foundation predicts that the entrepreneur's visa alone could generate 500,000 to 1.6 million new jobs during the next 10 years. These are real jobs with real economic impact that could boost GDP, by their estimate, by 1.5 percent or more. When we talk about economic growth and creating opportunity, a boost in GDP by 1.5 percent is a major accomplishment.

Recognizing this potential, several bills create visas for immigrant entrepreneurs. It is important that these visas be structured in a way to facilitate job creation. Unnecessarily high investment and revenue requirements and burdensome mandates, such as having to submit a business plan to Washington, DC, bureaucrats, threaten to diminish the impact these entrepreneurial visas could have.

Although well-intentioned, the INVEST visa created in the Senate immigration bill fell prey to some of these traps. To improve that idea, I developed an amendment with the help of entrepreneurs, investors, and startup policy experts. This amendment would reduce paperwork and reporting requirements so that entrepreneurs could spend more time building their businesses, allow entrepreneurs to secure initial investment from those closest

to them, add flexibility to the way in which startup employees are compensated to account for geographic and industry differences, and clarify that the jobs created by immigrant entrepreneurs must be held by Americans. A list of more than 30 startup companies, investors, and business leaders and immigration attorneys supported this amendment.

Sadly, like many other amendments, it was blocked from even receiving consideration. But in the end, that may not matter. The Speaker of the House has said the Senate immigration bill is "dead on arrival." Instead of taking up Senate legislation, the House is pursuing, perhaps, a more thoughtful, methodical approach to immigration—writing several targeted bills that address aspects of our broken immigration system.

Congress crafts better policy when it is done in manageable bite sizes. In my view we do not have to look far in the past to see what happens when Congress bites off more than it can chew. Implementation of the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank offer two examples of the unintended consequences of passing giant bills with multi-thousand pages that are poorly understood. In fact, it was the 1986 comprehensive immigration bill that left us with the many problems we are attempting to fix today. Passing a series of smaller more targeted immigration bills will result in better policy and achieve better results for the American people.

Moreover, there is broad agreement within Congress on many aspects of immigration policy. Last year the House of Representatives passed two immigration bills. One would have repurposed visas from the diversity lottery to STEM visas for some of our most talented foreign-born U.S. graduates. Another would have eliminated the employment-based, green card per-country cap allowing American employers to have access to the best talent regardless of where a potential employee was born.

This bill passed 389 to 15 in the House. Yet neither received a vote in the Senate because of adherence to the approach that says we can't do anything unless we do everything. This line of thinking has prevented progress on important challenges facing our country for a long time.

Republicans and Democrats agree that creating opportunities for highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants to contribute to our economy is beneficial to America. I strongly hope Congress will finally come together and pass what we can agree upon now while continuing to work on the issues that divide us. In my view, we can no longer allow ourselves to be hostage to the all-or-nothing strategy or wait until after the next election.

Right now other countries are taking advantage of our inability to solve problems and are exploiting our broken immigration system. Since I arrived in the Senate in 2011, at least seven countries have changed their policies and

laws to better attract highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants. One of those countries, Canada, even went so far as to buy a billboard in Silicon Valley in an attempt to poach the best and brightest.

We must address this problem, and the best way to do so is in a measured and incremental way. The benefits to our Nation's economy will be great and the goodwill produced by working in a bipartisan manner on targeted solutions will sow the seeds of trust necessary to solve the problems where disagreement remains.

So we will see what happens now in the immigration debate, but my hope is that if we are unable to pass so-called broad-based immigration reform, if we are unable to come up with sensible solutions in an understandable legislative package, let's at least work to accomplish those things on which there is broad agreement and continue to solve those problems where there remains disagreement today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH FUNDING

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is vital for the future health and well-being of citizens in our country; that is, funding for medical research for the National Institutes of Health. Unfortunately, NIH funding, like many other important Federal priorities, is being impacted by the across-the-board spending cuts. As we all know, we want to see that budget go down, we want to see the debt reduced, but we have to do it in a sensible way, not with a hammer.

Sequestration was never intended to be implemented and was supposed to bring Democrats and Republicans together to focus on smart solutions to reducing our debt.

I am a supporter of the work of the debt commission. I believe there is a way we can bring down our debt in a significant way. But I do not think we meant to have sequestration implemented in the way it is being implemented and seeing the kind of cuts we are seeing. These cuts are creating headwinds against short-term economic growth, reducing access to important services, and threatening our Nation's leadership in areas such as medical research. Congress needs to take a broader, long-term view toward our debt and deficit. That is why I support the Senate budget which would replace the sequester with targeted spending cuts and additional revenue, reducing the deficit in a balanced way.

I know Senator MURRAY, who heads up the Budget Committee, has been trying valiantly to get this budget to a conference committee, which is supported by the Democrats in the Senate and supported by Republicans such as Senator MCCAIN and Senator COLLINS. We have been stopped every step of the way, but this should go through regular order, into a conference committee so we can work out these differences with the House and replace sequester with something that makes sense.

Today I want to focus on the impact of sequestration on this particular area of the Federal budget; that is, medical research. It may not be the first thing you think of when you think about these cuts and what they mean, but I hope when you listen to my stories it brings out a whole new significance.

In the last century we have made enormous strides through medical and scientific research to understand the world around us. This research has led to a greater understanding of the nature and cause of disease and spurred a new generation of therapies and intervention to treat diseases.

Our country has been a leader in this era of scientific discovery, and we are responsible for developing many of the innovative therapies and scientific advances that have changed the face of science and given hope to millions of patients across the world. These advancements have been made possible by our commitment to funding research through the National Institutes of Health.

Currently, the NIH is the largest source of medical research funding in the world. Through its 27 Institutes, NIH funds research to prevent, detect, better treat, and even cure fatal and debilitating diseases such as cancer, heart disease, stroke, Alzheimer's, arthritis, diabetes, and mental health issues. The Institutes also fund basic science which provides the foundation for future breakthroughs in all fields of scientific discovery.

Researchers in my State tell me they cannot think of anything they do clinically that was not influenced by basic research made possible by NIH funding. Think of the advancements we have made. These clinical advancements are critical to improving health and saving the lives of millions of Americans.

To truly understand the importance of NIH, I think it is important to understand the impact on our own people, so I want to share some of the ways NIH funding has had influence in my State on people, on people such as Jim from Edina, MN.

Jim was 36 when he was diagnosed with an inoperable brain tumor in 1998. He was a professional engineer. He had an MBA from Northwestern Kellogg School of Management and worked in the family's 56-year-old air-conditioning and heating business, Owens Companies, Inc. He had everything to live for. But when Jim was diagnosed, there were almost no treatment op-

tions beyond radical surgery and radiation, so Jim looked for other options.

Over the course of the next 10 years he participated in multiple clinical trials and some seven treatments—all made possible by research grant funding. Jim passed away at age 46. But thanks to the clinical trials, he lived over 10 years, allowing his young son Max the chance to get to know his dad. He also was able to continue his lifelong athletic endeavors with a ride across the country with Livestrong in 2004 as part of the Tour of Hope, spreading the message of hope and survivorship.

The clinical trials, however, did not just help Jim. This is the key part, Mr. President, whether you are from Connecticut or from Minnesota. One of the trials in which Jim participated proved so effective that it is now the standard treatment regimen for people who are diagnosed with the same cancer as Jim. That would not have been possible if Jim had not been willing to go through those treatments and if they had not been funded by NIH.

Then there is Karen, a 48-year-old wife, mother of two teenagers, and a teacher. She was diagnosed with leukemia in August of 2005. With her type of leukemia, the prognosis is relatively good, and using the current treatments available she remained in remission until 2009. Then in the summer of 2009 she started feeling sick again and received news that the cancer had returned. Her only treatment option was a bone marrow transplant which had a 25-percent mortality rate. She and her husband visited with specialists and discovered that she had a mutation that did not respond to the current—at that time—frontline medication.

That is when she learned about clinical trials. In January 2010 she began her clinical trial journey and has now been involved in two clinical trials. She responded well to the second clinical trial and has been in remission for over 2 years. Her kids are now 17 and 13, and she and her husband are preparing to send their oldest daughter off to college in the fall of 2014.

NIH funding supports the research centers that make these stories like Jim's and Karen's possible. In Minnesota we have the Paul and Sheila Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Center, which is supported by NIH funding. This center has 46 faculty members in 7 University of Minnesota colleges and schools and receives \$6 million in annual funding from NIH.

Together, these scientists are conducting over 10 active clinical research studies that are giving hope to parents and patients with muscular dystrophy. This facility believes science is more than just about the research. The researchers here have volunteered hundreds of thousands of hours helping to educate the people they serve and ensuring these families have access to support networks. All of this is made possible in part because of Federal investment in the NIH.